LDC:	**Columbia Gas of Ohio**
Program Approval Date:	1/9/97
Program Size Limitations:	180,000 residential and small commercial
Enrollment Began	2/15/97
Enrollment Terminated	Continuous/ no sunset date would require a Commission order
Service Initiated	4/1/97
Customer Migration Rolling/ Fixed Enrollment	54,319 (See attached for monthly detail) Rolling enrollment
Principle Attributes: Mandatory/ Voluntary-Cost Responsibility	Voluntary/stranded cost recovery rider of .0234/mcf across all throughput accept those to whom COH flexed their rates. In anticipation of a statewide roll out of the COH program a joint stipulation and recommendation by the COH collaborative was approved by the PUCO on 1/7/98 that establishes a new funding mechanism designed to offset transition capacity costs (see attached)
Impact On Classes LDC & Residential End Users	See attached stipulation
Ways Decisions Are to be Reached on Capacity Renewal & Additions	See attached stipulation
Marketers Who Participated Affiliates	See attached list of marketers
Amount Stranded Cost & Cost Responsibility	See attached stipulation and detail of transition capacity cost recovery pool net balance
Extent Through Which Stranded Costs Were Reduced Through Mitigation	See attached detail of transition capacity cost recovery pool net balance.
Extent to Which Mandatory Assignment or Portfolio Auction of LDC Capacity appears to have affected the development of the program	No portfolio auction or mandatory capacity assignment.

References:

- Report to the PUCO on the "COH Customer Choice Program" filed 3/98 Case No. 96-1113-GA-ATA
- Columbia Collaborative Stipulation filed 11/27/97 Case No.'s 94-987-GA-AIR, 96-1113-GA-ATA. This stipulation established a funding mechanism to address transition capacity costs as the program expanded beyond Toledo. The stipulation was approved by the PUCO 1/7/98

LDC:	**East Ohio Gas**
Program Approval Date:	7/2/97
Program Size Limitations:	173,000 residential and small commercial
Enrollment Began:	12/1/97
Enrollment Terminated:	Eighteen month program
Service Initiated:	12/97
Customer Migration Rolling/ Fixed:	31,301 (See attached for monthly detail) Rolling enrollment
Principle Attributes: Mandatory/ Voluntary Cost Responsibility:	Mandatory assignment of resources to cover 79% of the design peak day requirements of the customers they serve. Favors local Appalachian production (pooling fee is higher for gas supplied on the interstate pipeline) .07/mcf balancing charge, imbalance trading fees.
Impact On Classes, LDC & Residential End Users	2.11 cents/mcf Transportation Migration Rider to cover program costs applied to all customers located in the areas which choice is offered. This rider was set up to recover certain program costs. In addition suppliers are assigned capacity which has a lower cost than the average cost of East Ohio's capacity portfolio.
Ways Decisions Are to be Reached On Capacity Renewal & Additions:	Can be expected that as their pipeline contract expires EOG will enter into short term seasonal requirement to meet CGR requirements.
Marketers Who Participated Affiliates:	Only 3 suppliers serving residential have at least 1% of the available market some marketers have stopped marketing to residentials. The affiliate (East Ohio Energy) has 86% market share.
Amount Stranded Cost & Cost Responsibility:	None determined currently
Extent Through Which Stranded Costs Were Reduced Through Mitigation:	NA
Extent to Which Mandatory Assignment or Portfolio Auction of LDC Capacity appears to have affected the development of the program	No portfolio auction of LDC capacity. Mandatory capacity assignment makes it impossible for a non local producing marketer to offer at least a 10% savings to small customers (residential) without losing money.

References:

- Report to the PUCO on the "Energy Choice Program" of East Ohio Gas Company Case No. 97-219-GA-GCR by Exeter Associates, Inc.

- Telephone Inquiries with IGS, Stand Energy, Volunteer Energy, MC2, and Keyspan
- Search of Ohio producers who filed bonds with the Oil and Gas Division of the PUCO.

LDC:	**SDG&E**
Program Approval Date:	1990 Decision (D) 91-02-040 Core Aggregation Transportation Program known as CAT
Program Size Limitations:	10% of total retail
Enrollment Began:	1991
Enrollment Terminated:	na
Service Initiated:	1991
Customer Migration Rolling/ Fixed Enrollment:	Rolling enrollment with a cap of 10% of total retail core demand. (See attached chart II-6, chart II-3)
Principle Attributes: Mandatory/ Voluntary Cost Responsibility:	Mandatory; unlike the non core customers (industrials) core customers have limited or no choices as it relates to interstate transportation and storage as these services are not unbundled from core rates.
Impact On Classes, LDC & Residential End Users	Currently core customers pay between 68% and 84% of total transportation costs. Non core rates do not include interstate pipeline demand charges and represent between 16% and 32% of total transportation costs. (See attached chart II-8)
Ways Decisions Are to be Reached On Capacity Renewal & Additions:	Certificating new expansion interstate and intrastate capacity is now governed by market policies in contrast with traditional regulatory policies, require no regulatory finding of need.
Marketers Who Participated Affiliates:	See attached list. Please note that the list does not designate whether the supplier is actively pursuing new customers.
Amount Stranded Cost & Cost Responsibility:	Total available interstate capacity exceeds average CA gas demand by 2 bcf/day.
Extent Through Which Stranded Costs Were Reduced Through Mitigation:	

Extent to Which Mandatory Assignment or Portfolio Auction of LDC Capacity appears to have affected the development of the program	No portfolio auction. SDG&E, SOCAL & PG&E "The CAPUC's policies over the last few years have reflected an increasing reliance on market forces to send accurate price signals to transporters and consumers and to ensure customers pay only for services they use." "Since 1991 the core aggregation transportation program has never reached its limit of 10% of core demand. Not only has it failed to reach its limit but also has declined since its inception in 1991." "the lackluster results of the CAT program, especially in comparison with the choice enjoyed by noncore customers, suggest that the lack of comprehensive unbundling is an obstacle to enhancing customer choice for core customers. It hinders meaningful choice in two ways. First, without unbundling, core customers and competing service providers cannot directly access various gas services such as **interstate transmission and storage**. Second the lack of unbundled services creates a barrier to entry for new firms who can provide substantive choice by marketing new and innovative bundled services for customers who do not wish to choose a provider for each gas service component." "By unbundling competitive services from monopoly services, new entrants have a realistic opportunity to compete in the market unencumbered by costs for services which they can provide more efficiently than the utility."

References:

- "Strategies for Natural Gas Reform: Exploring Options for Converging Energy Markets". A report to the California PUC by the Division of Strategic Planning 1/21/98. Pages 14,15,16,17,18,19,20 and 22.
- PG&E Gas Accord. Approved by the CAPUC in D.97-08-055. The settlement extends to 12/31/02.

LDC:	**SOCAL**
Program Approval Date:	1990 Decision (D) 91-02-040 Core Aggregation Transportation Program known as CAT
Program Size Limitations:	10% of total retail core demand SDG&E and SOCAL
Enrollment Began:	1991
Enrollment Terminated:	NA
Service Initiated:	1991
Customer Migration Rolling/ Fixed Enrollment:	Rolling enrollment with a cap of 10% of total retail core demand. (See attached chart II-5, chart II-2)
Principle Attributes: Mandatory/ Voluntary Cost Responsibility:	Economic mandatory; unlike the non core customers (industrials) core customers have limited or no choices as it relates to interstate transportation and storage as these services are not unbundled from core rates.
Impact On Classes, LDC & Residential End Users	Currently core customers pay between 68% and 84% of total transportation costs. Non core rates do not include interstate pipeline demand charges and represent between 16% and 32% of total transportation costs. (See attached chart II-8)
Ways Decisions Are to be Reached On Capacity Renewal & Additions:	Certificating new expansion interstate and intrastate capacity is now governed by market policies in contrast with traditional regulatory policies, require no regulatory finding of need.
Marketers Who Participated Affiliates:	See attached list. Please note that the list does not designate whether the supplier is actively pursuing new customers.
Amount Stranded Cost & Cost Responsibility:	Total available interstate capacity exceeds average CA gas demand by 2 bcf/day
Extent Through Which Stranded Costs Were Reduced Through Mitigation:	

Extent to Which Mandatory Assignment or Portfolio Auction of LDC Capacity appears to have affected the development of the program	No portfolio auction. SDG&E, SOCAL & PG&E "The CAPUC's policies over the last few years have reflected an increasing reliance on market forces to send accurate price signals to transporters and consumers and to ensure customers pay only for services they use." "Since 1991 the core aggregation transportation program has never reached its limit of 10% of core demand. Not only has it failed to reach its limit but also has declined since its inception in 1991." "the lackluster results of the CAT program, especially in comparison with the choice enjoyed by noncore customers, suggest that the lack of comprehensive unbundling is an obstacle to enhancing customer choice for core customers. It hinders meaningful choice in two ways. First, without unbundling, core customers and competing service providers cannot directly access various gas services such as **interstate transmission and storage**. Second the lack of unbundled services creates a barrier to entry for new firms who can provide substantive choice by marketing new and innovative bundled services for customers who do not wish to choose a provider for each gas service component." "By unbundling competitive services from monopoly services, new entrants have a realistic opportunity to compete in the market unencumbered by costs for services which they can provide more efficiently than the utility."

References:

- "Strategies for Natural Gas Reform: Exploring Options for Converging Energy Markets". A report to the California PUC by the Division of Strategic Planning 1/21/98. Pages 14,15,16,17,18, 19and 20.
- PG&E Gas Accord. Approved by the CAPUC in D.97-08-055. The settlement extends to 12/31/02.

LDC:	**PG&E**
Program Approval Date:	1990 Decision (D) 91-02-040 Core Aggregation Transportation Program known as CAT
Program Size Limitations:	Under PG&E's Gas Accord 10% limit lifted 12,000 mmbtu pool minimums.
Enrollment Began:	1991
Enrollment Terminated:	na
Service Initiated:	1991
Customer Migration Rolling/ Fixed Enrollment:	Rolling enrollment with a cap of 10% of core demand prior to the Gas Accord (see attached chart II-1, chart II-4)
Principle Attributes: Mandatory/ Voluntary Cost Responsibility:	Economic mandatory until 1996; unlike the non core customers (industrials) core customers have limited or no choices as it relates to interstate transportation and storage as these services are not unbundled from core rates. (See PG&E Gas Accord for exception)
Impact On Classes, LDC & Residential End Users	Currently core customers pay between 68% and 84% of total transportation costs. Non core rates do not include interstate pipeline demand charges and represent between 16% and 32% of total transportation costs. (See attached chart II-8)
Ways Decisions Are to be Reached On Capacity Renewal & Additions:	Certificating new expansion interstate and intrastate capacity is now governed by market policies in contrast with traditional regulatory policies, require no regulatory finding of need.
Marketers Who Participated Affiliates:	See attached list. Please note that the list does not designate whether the supplier is actively pursuing new customers.
Amount Stranded Cost & Cost Responsibility:	Total available interstate capacity exceeds average CA gas demand by 2 bcf/day (see impact on classes above)
Extent Through Which Stranded Costs Were Reduced Through Mitigation:	

Extent to Which Mandatory Assignment or Portfolio Auction of LDC Capacity appears to have affected the development of the program	No portfolio auction. SDG&E, SOCAL & PG&E "The CAPUC's policies over the last few years have reflected an increasing reliance on market forces to send accurate price signals to transporters and consumers and to ensure customers pay only for services they use." "Since 1991 the core aggregation transportation program has never reached its limit of 10% of core demand. Not only has it failed to reach its limit but also has declined since its inception in 1991." "the lackluster results of the CAT program, especially in comparison with the choice enjoyed by noncore customers, suggest that the lack of comprehensive unbundling is an obstacle to enhancing customer choice for core customers. It hinders meaningful choice in two ways. First, without unbundling, core customers and competing service providers cannot directly access various gas services such as **interstate transmission and storage**. Second the lack of unbundled services creates a barrier to entry for new firms who can provide substantive choice by marketing new and innovative bundled services for customers who do not wish to choose a provider for each gas service component." "By unbundling competitive services from monopoly services, new entrants have a realistic opportunity to compete in the market unencumbered by costs for services which they can provide more efficiently than the utility."

References:

- "Strategies for Natural Gas Reform: Exploring Options for Converging Energy Markets". A report to the California PUC by the Division of Strategic Planning 1/21/98. Pages 14,15,16,17,18,and 19
- PG&E Gas Accord. Approved by the CAPUC in D.97-08-055. The settlement extends to 12/31/02.

LDC:	**WGL**
Program Approval Date:	August 2, 1995,Revised Stipulation and Agreement Case No. 8683 approved 6/26//96. The most recent expansion to 100,000 customers was approved on 4/15/98.
Program Size Limitations:	Originally 6,000 then changed to 6500 to reflect additional customer sign ups after the open season had ended. In 1996 the program was expanded to 25,000. In 1998 it has recently been increased to 100,000 customers
Enrollment Began:	November, 1996 6/1/98 for schedules 2(a) and 3(a) as the recent expansion removed eligibility restrictions for commercial and industrial customers served under these schedules that use below 2,000 Dth of annual usage.7/1/98 for residential customers.
Enrollment Terminated:	5/1/98 when enrollment cap 25,000 is met or open season ended. The recently approved expansion will then take effect after the 5/98 expiration.
Service Initiated:	November 1996(originally) Second phase (with the enrollment cap of 25,000) was initiated on 11/1/97. 1998 expansion service begins 9/1/98
Customer Migration Rolling/ Fixed Enrollment:	72% of available residential market; 18132 residential, 5083 commercial, fixed open season. Under the 1998 expansion the program will now be an open enrollment.
Principle Attributes: Mandatory/ Voluntary Cost Responsibility:	Originally mandatory for commercial customers now voluntary. For the commercial program the capacity option was voluntary until a certain amount of DCQ was not taken and then any remaining load that went to the competitive market was assigned a prorata share of mandatory capacity. In the recent expansion that was filed on 3/31/98 WGL will continue to allow suppliers to obtain their own upstream pipeline capacity or take assignment from WGL. Suppliers have reasonable supply flexibility as there are three pipelines serving WGL.
Impact On Classes, LDC & Residential End Users:	Non transporting residential customers have $7.00cap on stranded cost exposure each year. Which represents less than 1% of their average bill.
Ways Decisions Are to be Reached On Capacity Renewal & Additions:	Determine what is needed for system supply/current sales customer base.

Marketers Who Participated Affiliates:	Four serving residential; ten serving commercial The 4 serving residential are; Washington Gas Energy Services Inc. (a wholly owned subsidiary of Washington Gas), Constellation Energy Source, Inc(BG&E affiliate), Connective Energy (division of Delmarva Power & Light), Horizon Energy (PECO's affiliate)
Amount Stranded Cost & Cost Responsibility:	Prior to the recent expansion the cost for stranded capacity was spread across all firm throughput on an interim basis. Total transition cost to date has been approximately $.60 a year for the residential (well below the $7.00 cap for residential customers under the recently approved expansion) and $.0032 per therm for the commercial.
Extent Through Which Stranded Costs Were Reduced Through Mitigation:	Recently moved the cut off date for monthly enrollment from the 14th to the 9th calendar day which allows the utility more time to market the excess capacity. WGL has been able to sell the capacity at 70% to 80% of the maximum tariff rate. (See attached).
Extent to Which Mandatory Assignment or Portfolio Auction of LDC Capacity appears to have affected the development of the program	By virtue of the fact that WGL switched from a partial mandatory program (for commercial customers) to a voluntary program and have continued it through the most recent expansion for suggests that a voluntary capacity disposition was and is favorable to a mandatory scheme. (See attached letter to the MD PSC regarding the interim cost recovery mechanism that was approved by the PSC which also discusses economic mandatory capacity assignment)

References:

- Jim Wagner, Andrea Crescioli Washington Gas Light
- Maryland Public service Commission ("Supplier Choice for Maryland Gas Customers., March 1998 Status" report)
- Letter to Daniel P. Gahagan, Executive Secretary Maryland Public Service Commission RE: Mail Log #5944-Revised Effective Date Modification to Delivery Service Procedures
- Letter to Daniel P. Gahagan, Executive Secretary Maryland Public Service Commission RE: WG Residential and Commercial Expansions July 30, 1997 Administrative Meeting
- Calvin Timmerman, Director of Rate Research and Economics Division Maryland Public Service Commission.

LDC:	**BG&E**
Program Approval Date:	Originally August 1995 for commercial customers. Approval in 1996 for the residential program which began in 1997
Program Size Limitations:	Cap of 25,000 customers. The MD PSC staff are continuing roundtable discussions with the objective of continuing to expand customer choice behind BG&E as well as the rest of the state.
Enrollment Began:	8/1/97
Enrollment Terminated:	When enrollment cap reached 25,000 on residential, pilot runs through 10/99.
Service Initiated:	11/1/97
Customer Migration Rolling/ Fixed Enrollment:	Rolling enrollment with capped market 25,000; 100% residential migration . 4,583 commercial customers
Principle Attributes: Mandatory/ Voluntary Cost Responsibility:	Voluntary, one year full rate release for DCQ suppliers at their option.
Impact On Classes, LDC & Residential End Users	
Ways Decisions Are to be Reached On Capacity Renewal & Additions:	First, some of the capacity may be taken by suppliers serving the customer base. Second, load growth will use some of the capacity. BG&E has grown by at least 10,000 residential customers each year. Third, BG&E should be able to release the excess capacity on the secondary market. Finally BG&E still has an incentive mechanism in place for off system sales. Recontracting has not been addressed by the staff of the MDPSC yet.
Marketers Who Participated Affiliates:	See attached. Seven serving residential; sixteen supplying commercial
Amount Stranded Cost & Cost Responsibility:	
Extent Through Which Stranded Costs Were Reduced Through Mitigation:	No specific data at this time
Extent to Which Mandatory Assignment or Portfolio Auction of LDC Capacity appears to have affected the development of the program	No LDC capacity auction/ BG&E has always been a voluntary capacity assignment program

References:

- D.Douglas DeWitt, Baltimore Gas & Electric
- Maryland Public Service Commission ("Supplier Choice for Maryland Gas Customers., March 1998 Status" report)
- Calvin Timmerman, Director of Rate Research and Economics Division Maryland Public Service Commission.